

Remarks

Support for the above-requested amendments to claim 1 is found at least on page 5, lines 14-19 and page 5, lines 25-33. Claims 1-11 have been amended for various grammatical reasons and/or to place the claims in U.S. format. Claims 12-15 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 16-24 are newly added. Support for new claim 16 is found at least on page 8, lines 10-13 and 23-26. New claim 17 is supported at least by page 7, line 30 to page 8, line 5. Support for new claim 18 is supported at least by page 5, lines 14-18. New claim 19 is supported at least by page 7, lines 5-12. Support for new claim 20 is found at least on page 6, lines 8-12. New claim 21 is supported at least by page 7, lines 13-16. Support for new claim 22 is found at least on page 6, lines 16-20. New claim 23 is supported at least by page 6, lines 21-25. Support for new claim 24 is found at least on page 6, lines 31-33. No question of new matter arises and entry of the above-requested amendments and new claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11 and 16-24 are before the Examiner for consideration.

Formal Matter

As shown above, Applicant has added new claims 16-24 by amendment (*i.e.*, nine claims). Additionally, claims 12-15 (*i.e.*, four claims) have been canceled without prejudice. Because the total number of claims Applicant is submitting for examination (*i.e.*, twenty claims) is not greater than the total number of claims previously presented and paid for (*i.e.*, twenty claims), Applicant respectfully submits that no additional filing fees are required for newly added claims 16-24.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that there are no fees required for new independent claim 16 because the total number of independent claims present in the application (*i.e.*, two independent claims) does not exceed the total amount of independent claims permitted without incurring additional fees (*i.e.*, three independent claims). Furthermore, because support for newly added claims 16-24 is found throughout the specification, as identified in the opening paragraph of the Remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that these newly added claims do not contain any new matter.

Claim Objections

Claim 4-14 have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being in improper form. In particular, it is asserted that claims 4-14 are multiple dependent claims that

improperly depend from multiple dependent claims. The Examiner states that claims 4-14 have not been examined on their merits.

Initially, Applicant submits that claims 12-14 have been canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering the objection of these claims moot.

In response to the objection to the remaining claims, Applicant has amended claims 4-11 to remove the multiple dependencies. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner remove this objection and examine claims 4-11 on their merits.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 1-3 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner asserts that claims 1 and 2 require “at least one monofilament” but does not specify that the monofilament is not the glass fiber. With respect to claim 15, the Examiner asserts that claim 15 provides for the use of a knit of glass fiber, but does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process.

Initially, Applicant submits that claim 15 has been canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering the rejection of this claim moot.

In response to the rejection of claims 1-3, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the singular thickness-providing layer is in the form of a “knit comprising glass fibers and at least one monofilament”. Applicant submits that it is clear from amended claim 1 that the monofilament is part of the knit forming the singular thickness-providing layer. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 1 renders claims 1-3 sufficiently definite. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed recitation of use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process.

Applicant submits that claim 15 has been canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)/(e)

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)/(e) as being anticipated by WO 96/27039 to Claeys and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0010154 to Claeys (collectively referred to as “Claeys”). The Examiner asserts that Claeys discloses strengthening materials suitable for reinforcement in composites that include at least one singular thickness-providing layer in the form of a knit of glass fibers and at least one singular strengthening layer connected to the singular thickness-providing layer. In addition, it is asserted that the layers are fastened together by a polyester thread. The Examiner has equated the polyester thread with the claimed monofilament.

Applicant’s Response

In response to this rejection, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner’s attention to the amendments made to claim 1 and submits that claim 1 defines a strengthening material that is not taught (or suggested) within Claeys. Applicant submits that Claeys does not teach or suggest a strengthening material that includes (1) at least one singular thickness-providing layer in the form of a knit comprising glass fibers and at least one monofilament and (2) at least one singular strengthening layer connected to the singular thickness-providing layer.

In particular, it is respectfully submitted that Claeys does not teach (or suggest) a singular thickness-providing layer in the form of a knit comprising glass fibers and at least one monofilament. Claeys teaches strengthening materials that include a thickness-providing layer formed of a knit of glass fibers.¹ Claeys simply does not teach or even suggest a thickness-providing layer that is formed of a knit including glass fibers and at least one monofilament as required by claim 1. Indeed, Claeys is silent regarding any teaching (or suggestion) of a thickness-providing layer that includes at least one monofilament fiber.

As is well established, in order for a reference to be anticipatory, each and every element of the claimed invention must be found within the four corners of the cited reference. It is respectfully submitted that because Claeys does not teach a singular thickness-providing layer in the form of a knit comprising glass fibers and at least one monofilament as required by claim 1, Claeys is not an anticipatory reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, and all claims dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by Claeys.

¹ See, e.g., page 2, lines 30-32; page 3, lines 9-13; and the Abstract of WO 96/27039 and paragraphs [0008] and [0011] of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0010154.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that claims 1-3 are not anticipated by Claeys and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

In light of the above, Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance and therefore requests favorable consideration.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0568 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 4, 2010

/Kathryn W. Grant/
Kathryn W. Grant, Reg. #33238

Owens Corning
Patent Department, Bldg. 21-0
2790 Columbus Road
Granville, Ohio 43023
(740) 321-7213